



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

ck
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/750,118	12/31/2003	Peter Sterling Mueller	893-2 CIP II /DIV	9765
23869	7590	05/03/2006	EXAMINER	
HOFFMANN & BARON, LLP			JONES, DWAYNE C	
6900 JERICO TURNPIKE			ART UNIT	
SYOSSET, NY 11791			PAPER NUMBER	

1614

DATE MAILED: 05/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/750,118

Applicant(s)

MUELLER, PETER STERLING

Examiner

Dwayne C. Jones

Art Unit

1614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on the response of 27MAR2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,6,7,10,11,18,19,22,23,26-28 and 31-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1,3,6,7,10,11,18,19,22,23,26-28,31-34 and 39-41 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 35-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) See Continuation Sheet are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).


* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.


DWAYNE JONES
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/21/03.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims subject to restriction and/or election requirement are 1,3,6,7,10,11,18,19,22,23,26-28,31-34 and 39-41.



DWAYNE JONES
PRIMARY EXAMINER

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. Claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 10, 11, 18, 19, 22, 23, 26-28, and 31-41 are pending.
2. Claims 35-38 were elected and rejected.
3. Claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 10, 11, 18, 19, 22, 23, 26-28, 31-34, and 39-41 are non-elected and withdrawn from consideration.

Election/Restrictions

4. Applicant's election with traverse of Group XI, corresponding to claims 35-38 of March 27, 2006 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that these inventions are not independent and distinct. This is not found persuasive because each of the individual groups are directed to treating a various distinct diseases as well as symptoms of various disease states.
5. The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.
This application contains claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 10, 11, 18, 19, 22, 23, 26-28, 31-34, and 39-41 drawn to an invention nonelected with traverse in the response of March 27, 2006. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

Information Disclosure Statement

6. The information disclosure statement filed December 21, 2003 (6 sheets) have been reviewed and considered, see enclosed copy of PTO FORM 1449.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

8. Claims 35-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

9. *Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly & Co.*, 119 F.3d 1559, 1568 (Fed. Cir. 1997), cert. denied, 523 U.S. 1089, 118 S.Ct. 1548 (1980), holds that an adequate written description requires a precise definition, such as by structure, formula, chemical name, or physical properties, "not a mere wish or plan for obtaining the claimed chemical invention." *Eli Lilly*, 119 F.3d at 1566. The Federal Circuit has adopted the standard set forth in the Patent and Trademark Office ("PTO") Guidelines for *Examination of Patent Applications Under the 35 U.S.C. 112, 1 "Written Description" Requirement* ("Guidelines"), 66 Fed. Reg. 1099 (Jan. 5, 2001), which state that the

written description requirement can be met by “showing that an invention is complete by disclosure of sufficiently detailed, relevant identifying characteristics, “including, inter alia, “functional characteristics when coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between function and structure....” *Enzo Biochem, Inc. v. Gen-Probe.*, 296 F.3d, 316, 1324-25 (Fed. Cir. 2002) (quoting Guidelines, 66 Fed. Reg. At 1106 (emphasis added)). Moreover, although *Eli Lilly* and *Enzo* were decided within the factual context of DNA sequences, this does not preclude extending the reasoning of those cases to chemical structures in general. *Univ. of Rochester v. G.D. Searle & Co.*, 249 F. Supp.2d 216, 225 (W.D.N.Y 2003).

10. There is insufficient descriptive support for the phrase, “derivatives of sibutramine”. In addition, the instant specification does not describe what is meant by the phrase, “derivatives of sibutramine”. Structural identifying characteristics of the phrase, “derivatives of sibutramine” are not disclosed. There is no evidence that there is any per se structure/function relationship between the phrase, “derivatives of sibutramine”. The instant specification does not provide an adequate written description for the phrase, “derivatives of sibutramine”. Accordingly, these claims fail to comply with the written description requirement.

11. Claims 35-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for sibutramine, does not reasonably provide enablement for the enablement of (1) derivatives of sibutramine nor (2) the plethora of compounds that are only known as possessing the pharmacological activity of being

known as inhibitors of dopamine, serotonin, and norepinephrine. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

12. The factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure meets the enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, have been described in In re Wands, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Among these factors are: (1) the nature of the invention; (2) the state of the prior art; (3) the relative skill of those in the art; (4) the predictability or unpredictability of the art; (5) the breadth of the claims; (6) the amount of direction or guidance presented; (7) the presence or absence of working examples; and (8) the quantity of experimentation necessary. When the above factors are weighed, it is the examiner's position that one skilled in the art could not practice the invention without undue experimentation.

(1) The nature of the invention:

The instant invention is directed to the functional recitation of compounds which known to possess the pharmacological property of simply being known as a selective reuptake inhibitors for dopamine, serotonin, and norepinephrine. The method comprises administering these functional, recitation of compounds which known to possess the pharmacological property of simply being known as a selective reuptake inhibitors for dopamine, serotonin, and norepinephrine, for the treatment of complex regional pain syndrome.

(2) The state of the prior art

The compounds of the inventions are the functional recitation of compounds which known to possess the pharmacological property of simply being known as a selective reuptake inhibitors for dopamine, serotonin, and norepinephrine. However, the prior art reference of Young of WO 94/00114 does not teach that these compounds that possess the functional recitation of the pharmacological property of simply being known as a selective reuptake inhibitors for dopamine, serotonin, and norepinephrine for the treatment of pain in complex regional pain syndrome.

(3) The relative skill of those in the art

The relative skill of those in the art of is very high.

(4) The predictability or unpredictability of the art

The unpredictability of the pharmaceutical art is very high. In fact, the courts have made a distinction between mechanical elements function the same in different circumstances, yielding predictable results, chemical and biological compounds often react unpredictably under different circumstances. Nationwide Chem. Corp. v. Wright, 458 F. Supp. 828, 839, 192 USPQ 95, 105(M.D. Fla. 1976); Aff'd 584 F.2d 714, 200 USPQ 257 (5th Cir. 1978); In re Fischer, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 10, 24 (CCPA 1970). Thus, the physiological activity of a chemical or biological compound is considered to be an unpredictable art. For example, in Ex Parte Sudilovsky, the Court held that Appellant's invention directed to a method for preventing or treating a disease

known as tardive dyskinesia using an angiotensin converting enzyme inhibitor involved unpredictable art because it concerned the pharmaceutical activity of the compound. 21 USPQ2d 1702, 1704-5 (BDAI 1991); In re Fisher, 427 F.2d 1557, 1562, 29 USPQ, 22 (holding that the physiological activity of compositions of adrenocorticotrophic hormones was unpredictable art); In re Wright, 999 F.2d 1557, 1562, 29 USPQ d, 1570, 1513-14 (Fed. Cir. 1993) (holding that the physiological activity of RNA viruses was unpredictable art); Ex Parte Hitzeman, 9 USPQ2d 1821, 1823 (BDAI 1987); Ex Parte Singh, 17 USPQ2d 1714, 1715, 1716 (BPAI 1990). Likewise, the physiological or pharmaceutical activity of the functional recitation of compounds, which are known to possess the pharmacological property of simply being known as a selective reuptake inhibitors for dopamine, serotonin, and norepinephrine prior to filing of the instant invention was an unpredictable art.

(5) The breadth of the claims

The instant claims are very broad. For instance, claim 35 is directed to the plethora of compounds of that are embraced by the functional recitation of being known as a compound that is known to have the pharmacological property of being known as a selective reuptake inhibitors for dopamine, serotonin, and norepinephrine. The breadth of claims was a factor in Amgen v. Chugai Pharm. Co., 927 F.2d 1200, 18 USPQ2d (Fed. Cir.), cert. Denied, 502 U.S. 856 (1991). In the Amgen case, the patent claims were directed to DNA sequences that encoded amino acid sequences. Because a very small change in the amino acid sequence of a protein can result in a very large

Art Unit: 1614

change in the structure-function activity of a protein and because the laws of protein folding are in such a primitive state, predicting protein structure (and hence, activity) while knowing only the sequence of the protein is akin to predicting the weather for a date in the future.

(6) The amount of direction or guidance presented

The amount of guidance or direction needed to enable the invention is inversely related to the degree of predictability in the art. In re Fisher, 839, 166 USPQ 24. Thus, although a single embodiment may provide broad enablement in cases involving predictable factors, such as mechanical or electrical elements, in cases involving unpredictable factors, such as most chemical reactions and physiological activity, more teaching or guidance is required. In re Fischer, 427 F.2d 839, 166 USPQ 24; Ex Parte Hitzeman, 9 USPQ 2d 1823. For example, the Federal Circuit determined that, given the unpredictability of the physiological activity of RNA viruses, a specification requires more than a general description and a single embodiment to provide an enabling disclosure for a method of protecting an organism against RNA viruses. In re Wright, 999 F.2d 1562-63, 27 USPQ2d 1575. In the instant case, given the unpredictability of the physiological or pharmaceutical activity of a compounds that have the pharmacological property of being known as a selective reuptake inhibitors for dopamine, serotonin, and norepinephrine, which are used to treat pain in complex regional pain syndrome is insufficient for enablement. The specification provides no guidance, in the way of enablement for sibutramine. In addition, the specification does

not provide any enablement of derivatives or analogues of sibutramine that could be employed in this invention other than sibutramine itself. In re Fisher, 427 F.2d 833, 166 USPQ 18 (CCPA 1970) (contrasting mechanical and electrical elements with chemical reactions and physiological activity). See also In re Wright, 999 F.2d 1557, 27 USPQ2d 1510 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). This is because it is not obvious from the disclosure of one species, what other species will work. In re Dreshfield, 110 F.2d 235, 45 USPQ 36 (CCPA 1940), gives this general rule: "It is well settled that in cases involving chemicals and chemical compounds, which differ radically in their properties it must appear in an applicant's specification either by the enumeration of a sufficient number of the members of a group or by other appropriate language, that the chemicals or chemical combinations included in the claims are capable of accomplishing the desired result." The article "Broader than the Disclosure in Chemical Cases," 31 J.P.O.S. 5, by Samuel S. Levin covers this subject in detail. A disclosure should contain representative examples, which provide reasonable assurance to one skilled in the art that the compounds fall within the scope of a claim will possess the alleged activity. See In re Riat et al. (CCPA 1964) 327 F2d 685, 140 USPQ 471; In re Barr et al. (CCPA 1971) 444 F 2d 349, 151 USPQ 724.

(7) The presence or absence of working examples

As stated above, the specification discloses compounds that have the pharmacological property of being known as a selective reuptake inhibitors for dopamine, serotonin, and norepinephrine that are used to treat reflex sympathetic

dystrophy. However, the instant specification only has enablement for the compound of sibutramine rather than its derivatives.

(8) The quantity of experimentation necessary

The quantity of experimentation needed to be performed by one skilled in the art is yet another factor involved in the determining whether "undue experimentation" is required to make and use the instant invention. "The test is not merely quantitative, since a considerable amount of experimentation is permissible, if it is merely routine, or if the specification in question provides a reasonable amount of guidance with respect to the direction in which the experimentation should proceed." In re Wands, 858 F.2d 737, 8 USPQ2d 1404 (citing In re Angstadt, 537 F.2d 489, 502-04, 190 USPQ 214, 218 (CCPA 1976)). For these reasons, one of ordinary skill in the art would be burdened with undue "painstaking experimentation study" to determine all of the types and derivatives of compounds that are known in the art simply by the functional recitation of pharmacological property that acts as a selective reuptake inhibitors for dopamine, serotonin, and norepinephrine for the treatment of pain in complex regional pain syndrome that would be enabled in this specification.

13. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

14. Claims 35-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

applicant regards as the invention. The word “derivatives” fails to provide one skilled in the art with standard for determining what is embraced and encompassed with the word “derivatives”. Without such clear information, one skilled is vaguely provided with a information concerning what is embraced by the word “derivatives”. Consequently, this claim is rendered vague and indefinite.

15. Claims 35-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The following reasons support this rejection. It is unclear to the skilled artisan as to what specifically the instantly claimed compounds, sibutramine or sibutramine salts, are to be used therapeutically for or what is the intended benefit/risk ratio applicable for the claimed compound of sibutramine or sibutramine salts to a medical treatment? In addition, what is meant by the phrase, “effective amount”? Moreover, this ambiguous phrase does not clearly state what is to be therapeutically effected with a dose of sibutramine or sibutramine salts. This rejection could be obviated with the incorporation of the following phrase or equivalent “for treating reflex sympathetic dystrophy with the administration of sibutramine or sibutramine salts.

Double Patenting

16. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct

Art Unit: 1614

from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

17. Claims 35-38 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 7, 14, 16, and 17 of U.S. Patent No. 6,323,242. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both the instantly claimed subject matter as well as U.S. Patent No. 6,323,242 teach of treating pain with the administration of sibutramine and its salts and also with the addition of antiepileptic or anti-depressants. Clearly, one having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to utilize sibutramine for the treatment of pain in complex regional pain syndrome especially in view of the fact that U.S. Patent No. 6,323,242 teaches to the skilled artisan that it is known in the art that sibutramine is useful for the treatment of pain.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to D. C. Jones whose telephone number is (571) 272-


Art Unit: 1614

0578. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays, Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Fridays from 8:30 am to 6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ardin Marschel, may be reached at (571) 272-0718. The official fax No. for correspondence is (571)-273-8300.

Also, please note that U.S. patents and U.S. patent application publications are no longer supplied with Office actions. Accordingly, the cited U.S. patents and patent application publications are available for download via the Office's PAIR, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. As an alternate source, all U.S. patents and patent application publications are available on the USPTO web site (www.uspto.gov), from the Office of Public Records and from commercial sources.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications may be obtained from Private PAIR only. For more information about PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have any questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 1-866-217-9197 (toll free).


DWAYNE JONES
PRIMARY EXAMINER
Tech. Ctr. 1614
April 30, 2006